



**South Mountain Corridor Study  
Citizens Advisory Team  
Meeting Summary**

---

**Date:** October 23, 2008  
**Time:** 6 p.m.  
**Location:** South Mountain Community College

**SMCAT Members Attending:**

Ahwatukee Foothills Chamber of Commerce, Laura Rivers  
Ahwatukee Village Planning Committee, Laurel Arndt  
Arizona Public Health Association, Al Brown  
Bougainvillea HOA, Timmothy Stone  
Calabrea HOA, Brian Smith  
City of Avondale, Carnell Thurman  
Estrella Village Planning Committee, Peggy Eastburn  
Foothills Club West HOA, Michael Hinz  
Foothills Reserve HOA, Jim Wesley  
Lakewood HOA, Eve Morse  
Laveen Citizens for Responsible Development, Laurie Prendergast  
Laveen Village Planning Committee, Wes Lines  
Maricopa County Farm Bureau, Clayton Danzeisen  
Phoenix Mountains Preservation Council, Michael Goodman  
Sierra Club, Sandy Bahr  
Southwest Valley Chamber of Commerce, Woody Thomas  
The Foothills HOA, Gary Reny  
Valley Forward, Steve Barclay

**SMCAT Members Absent:**

Arizona Trucking Association, Dave Williams  
Arlington HOA, Camilo Acosta  
City of Tolleson  
East Valley Partnership, Jack Sellers  
Gila River Indian Community–District 4  
Kyrene Elementary School District, Terry Tatterfield  
Mountain Park Ranch HOA, Diane Krecker  
Pecos Road/I-10 Landowners Association, Nathaniel Percharo  
Silverado Ranch  
South Mountain Village Planning Committee, Tamala Daniels  
South Mountain/Laveen Chamber of Commerce, Lisa Bray

**Staff and Consultants**

Michael Bruder, ADOT  
 Mark Hollowell, ADOT  
 Velvet Mathew, ADOT  
 Timothy Tait, ADOT  
 Nan Wilcox, ADOT  
 Ken Davis, FHWA  
 Bill Vachon, FHWA  
 Michael Book, HDR

Heather Honsberger, HDR  
 Ben Spargo, HDR  
 Scott Stapp, HDR  
 Fred Erickson, KCA  
 Tom Keller, KCA  
 C. Murphy Hebert, PDG  
 Dean Howard, PDG

**Citizens:**

Jim Jochim  
 Steve Johnson  
 Tim Lank  
 Pat Lawlis  
 Don McCowen  
 Lou Misturini  
 Jim Morse

Doug Murphy  
 William Ramsay  
 Katie Raskin  
 Devi Samudrala  
 Connie Samuels  
 Irene Wesley  
 Valerie Wildemann

Meeting Agenda	Speaker
Welcome and introductions	Tom Keller, KCA
SMCAT role and responsibilities	Tom Keller, KCA
Upcoming SMCAT meeting topics	Tom Keller, KCA
SMCAT questions and comments	All
Cumulative and secondary impacts	Mark Hollowell, ADOT Scott Stapp, HDR
Public comments	Timothy Tait, ADOT
Air quality panel	Tom Keller, KCA All
SMCAT communication process	Tom Keller, KCA All
Visitor comment session	Tom Keller, KCA Public

*Meeting began at 6:02 p.m.*

**Tom Keller:** Good evening everyone. Can we begin please? Thank you.

Welcome to the October 23 Citizens Advisory Team meeting for the proposed South Mountain Freeway. This evening we will follow the same agenda format that we have used in the past.

I would like to welcome the members of the SMCAT who are in attendance tonight, who are located at the table. I also welcome the members of the public, who are seated in the back of the room. Finally, I also would like to welcome the members of the study team, who are all wearing nametags and seated about the room.

The sole purpose of the SMCAT is to make a recommendation whether to construct this proposed freeway.

It was agreed upon a while ago that the SMCAT and meeting attendees conduct themselves in accordance with the operating agreement that everyone treats each other with mutual courtesy, respect and dignity throughout the process. When asking a question, please listen to the response before asking a follow-up question. I will ensure that everyone gets a chance to ask his or her questions.

Murphy Hebert is seated at the back table. If you are a member of the public and wish to ask a question, she has blue question and comment cards for you to write down your comment or question. Near the end of the meeting, we will collect these cards. You can either read your question to the group or submit it to me and I will read it.

At the break tonight, I will be giving the SMCAT members a session feedback form. Please complete both sides of this form and return it to any of the study team members before you leave tonight. Your feedback helps us to continually improve this meeting process.

The upcoming SMCAT meetings are unscheduled. The remaining topic that will be discussed is air quality, which will be presented by panel members that will be suggested by the SMCAT. These meetings will be scheduled so that they are in close proximity to the public release of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Fred, have I left anything out?

**Fred Erickson:** Yes. The SMCAT needs to remember to report back to their respective organizations.

**Tom Keller:** The SMCAT is charged with reporting back to the organizations that each member represents. The members should be taking the information from these meetings and provide it to his or her organizations to discuss. Any questions or input from the organizations can be discussed in the SMCAT meetings. The most important thing is to make sure that there is ongoing communication between each SMCAT member and the organization he or she represents.

**Fred Erickson:** All of the information presented at the past SMCAT meetings is available on the study Web site. So if you need to access anything from a past meeting, it is available there.

**Tom Keller:** Before we begin the presentations for cumulative and secondary impacts and public comments, does the SMCAT have any questions or comments regarding anything that has been published in the newspapers?

**SMCAT Member:** I have a question about the information presented in an article about ADOT's budget shortfall. Is it okay to ask a question on this topic at this time?

**Tom Keller:** Yes. This would be the time to ask that question.

**SMCAT Member:** The information contained in the article was confusing because it appeared to be different from what was discussed in the last SMCAT meeting. At the end of the last SMCAT meeting, it was mentioned that the freeway cost you gave us was based on the six-lane freeway. It appeared that the article in the newspaper reported that the cost was based on a 10-lane roadway and that ADOT could save money by scaling back the project so that it would only be six lanes.

**Mike Bruder:** There are two parts to the answer. ADOT would be purchasing the right-of-way for the ultimate freeway design of 10 lanes. If the freeway were constructed, it would only be a six-lane facility, until future growth would warrant expansion to a 10-lane roadway. Does that answer your question?

**SMCAT Member:** It is still a little muddled.

**Mike Bruder:** The article referred to ADOT cutting back on right-of-way expenses.

**SMCAT Member:** Last meeting you said that ADOT would purchase the right-of-way for a 10-lane freeway and would construct the lanes so that the future additional four lanes would be in the median.

**Mike Bruder:** If ADOT didn't purchase the right-of-way for a 10-lane facility, it would limit the possible future expansion of this proposed freeway.

**SMCAT Member:** So are you saying that this \$2.4 billion proposed freeway would only contain six lanes?

**Ben Spargo:** No.

**SMCAT Member:** It sounds as though the plans are changing so that this proposed freeway would now be a parkway. I thought this was ruled out as a possibility.

**Mike Bruder:** ADOT has no plans to construct this roadway as a parkway.

**SMCAT Member:** So if this freeway were changed from an ultimate 10-lane roadway to six lanes, would this alter the study's purpose and need? Would you have to revisit this in the Draft EIS?

**Ben Spargo:** If the scope changed, we would have to revisit everything.

**Mike Bruder:** Yes, we would have to go back and look at the Draft EIS.

**SMCAT Member:** So, you would have to reevaluate the current study's purpose and need?

**Ben Spargo:** Yes.

**SMCAT Member:** In the parking lot memorandum, is ADOT's response in regards to the annual loss of property tax revenue based on the current tax rate?

**Ben Spargo:** Yes. The information presented is based on the current tax rate and each land type has a certain property tax associated with it.

**SMCAT Member:** Are the school district properties taxed differently?

**Ben Spargo:** Yes. The different land types have different property tax rates.

**SMCAT Member:** On page four of the parking lot issues memorandum, ADOT's response is that the additional cost for the six-lane roadway to be a 10-lane roadway would be \$300 million dollars. Is that amount reported in today's dollars?

**Ben Spargo:** Yes.

**SMCAT Member:** What would be the timeframe for this roadway expansion?

**Ben Spargo:** There is no designated timeframe for the potential widening of this proposed freeway from 6 to 10 lanes. Because of this, the \$300 million estimate is our best guess in today's dollars.

**SMCAT Member:** I have one more question about an ADOT response on page three of the parking lot issues memorandum. ADOT has said that there is a dollar amount of \$16.25 per hour that can be associated with a person's time spent sitting in freeway traffic. Is there a dollar amount that ADOT can provide that would be associated with the time that people would spend while sitting in traffic during construction of a freeway?

**Ben Spargo:** We didn't consider that in this study.

**SMCAT Member:** Well, is there a way to consider that?

**Ben Spargo:** I am not familiar if there is a study associated with that. I will need to take this question back to the study team for discussion.

**SMCAT Member:** Since the issue of time savings has been brought up, I would also be curious to know the cost of time savings during the construction phase.

**Bill Vachon:** In the study process, it would be very difficult to capture this kind of detail at this time. The construction would be divided into phases and this information has yet to be discussed.

**SMCAT Member:** I wanted to clarify something. The Draft EIS will be based on this proposed freeway being 10 lanes, correct?

**Mike Bruder:** Yes.

**SMCAT Member:** Well, if the scope changes and the freeway is reduced to an ultimate construction of six lanes, is ADOT still going to buy the right-of-way for a 10-lane freeway? I am confused about this. It seems that if ADOT purchases the freeway for a 10-lane freeway, some people would lose their homes for nothing. When is the purchase of right-of-way established?

**Mike Bruder:** The designated right-of-way required for this proposed freeway would be official when the EIS is completed and the document is signed. This would officially establish the freeway corridor. If something changes during the study, we would need to go back and address different elements before determining the right-of-way for the freeway corridor.

**SMCAT Member:** When would ADOT buy these properties?

**Bill Vachon:** The environmental document will identify the scope. After this process is completed, the study team will develop the design. From that point, ADOT would proceed with right-of-way purchasing, as designated in the environmental document.

**SMCAT Member:** That is confusing.

**SMCAT Member:** What you are telling me is that the right-of-way is set in the EIS?

**Bill Vachon:** The initial right-of-way designated in the EIS would be for the six-lane freeway, but ADOT is considering the need for the possible future expansion of this proposed freeway. That would be the case, if the decision in the Final EIS is to construct this freeway.

**SMCAT Member:** What I am trying to understand is if the Final EIS will determine that the proposed freeway would be 10 lanes, regardless of the study's purpose and need?

**Bill Vachon:** Well, the information in the EIS could change.

**SMCAT Member:** So if in fact the Draft EIS does not support a 10-lane freeway then the 10-lane roadway would be off the books?

**Bill Vachon:** Yes.

**SMCAT Member:** But ADOT is continuing to talk about a 10-lane roadway. It seems that the freeway may now only be six lanes. I don't want this point to get confused.

**Mike Bruder:** At this point, the study's purpose and need has not changed.

**SMCAT Member:** So unless something changes, the Draft EIS will be addressing the required right-of-way for a 10-lane facility?

**Mike Bruder:** Yes.

**SMCAT Member:** So at this point in time, we are not going to have any SMCAT meetings until the Draft EIS is released to the public? How many days will we have to comment on the draft?

**Ben Spargo:** That information will be part of the public comment presentation tonight.

**SMCAT Member:** Has there been any resolution with the Gila River Indian Community regarding Traditional Cultural Properties?

**Mike Bruder:** No. There has not been a resolution with this issue.

**Tom Keller:** Before we continue, I would like to announce that there are a few people here substituting for the regular SMCAT members. Gary Reny is here for Chad Blostone with The Foothills HOA, Eve Morse is here in place of Chris Boettcher with the Lakewood HOA and Laura Rivers is here for Carola Tamarkin with the Ahwatukee Foothills Chamber of Commerce. Welcome and thank you for joining us tonight.

**SMCAT Member:** In the last SMCAT meeting, it was mentioned that ADOT would intend on compensating homeowner associations from lost tax revenues related to the properties that would be needed by ADOT for this proposed freeway. Is there a formula that has been developed so that we would know how much each homeowner association would be compensated?

**Ben Spargo:** The ADOT Right-of-Way Group is developing a system right now. I am not at liberty to discuss this since ADOT would be negotiating with the various homeowner associations to resolve this issue.

**SMCAT Member:** Last month ADOT presented the projected cost of this proposed freeway. Were legal expenses included in the projected acquisition costs?

**Ben Spargo:** Yes. These expenses were included in the projected right-of-way costs. This included items such as appraisal fees and legal expenses.

**SMCAT Member:** I read a newspaper article recently that kept quoting the Maricopa Association of Government's Transportation Director, Eric Anderson. Is he in attendance here tonight?

**Ben Spargo:** No.

**SMCAT Member:** In the newspaper article, Eric Anderson mentioned streamlining the study environmental process to deal with the budget shortfall. I was wondering if he had this study in mind when he made that comment.

**Ben Spargo:** It is a goal of all the agencies to conduct the environmental process as quickly as possible. In some cases, the process takes longer.

**Tom Keller:** Okay. Let's move forward with the agenda with the presentation of cumulative and secondary impacts.

By the way, we have a quorum tonight so this is an official meeting.

**Mark Hollowell:** Hello. I am Mark Hollowell.

Last month, Pat Higgins from HDR and I discussed the topic of social conditions with you from a NEPA point of view. You may recall from one of my earlier presentations that NEPA is the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and is the umbrella under which many environmental laws, acts and executive orders reside.

The presentation tonight will be presented by myself and Scott Stapp of HDR. It will include an overview of what cumulative and secondary impacts are, why we study them, and what the results of the analysis for the proposed action were. Two specific types of impacts, induced travel demand and growth and greenhouse gas emissions will also be discussed.

Federal guidance defines cumulative impacts as: "...the impact on the environment which usually results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonable foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (federal or non-federal) or person undertakes such other actions...., Cumulative impacts are considered direct effects, which are caused by the actions and occur at the same time and place." This quote is from the Code of Federal Regulations regarding the President's Council of Environmental Quality's regulations for implementing NEPA. In basic terms, cumulative impacts occur where several actions in an area combine to create an impact greater than any one individual activity.

Secondary impacts, sometimes referred to as indirect impacts are “...caused by the action and are later in time or farther removed in distance, but are still reasonably foreseeable... indirect effects may included growth-inducing effects and other effects related to induced changes in the pattern of land use, population density or growth rate and related effects on air and water and other natural systems, including ecosystems”

This quote is also from the Code of Federal Regulations. An example of indirect effects is when a new highway interchange is constructed, a cross street can attract development, such as a gas station.

So why do we undertake the study? The Phoenix metropolitan area is growing rapidly and is projected to continue this growth well into the future. We study cumulative and secondary impacts first of all because it is required. In doing so, it is important to understand and disclose all of the potential impacts from a project as mandated by NEPA. This would include evaluating cumulative impacts provides an understanding of the overall condition of each resource and how it would be affected by the proposed freeway. Also, it must be considered that the proposed freeway may result in impacts which occur elsewhere or later in time; secondary impacts are evaluated to identify if such impacts would occur.

Public disclosure is a primary reason to conduct secondary and cumulative analyses and speaks directly to a primary NEPA intent of public disclosure. In many instances it presents a comprehensive view of all actions affecting the environment. Understanding the project's contribution and understanding of differences among alternatives, if any, is important to the primary decision making aspect of NEPA. How big or small the project's contribution is to a resource's impacts and if any of the alternatives would cause substantially greater or lesser impacts than other alternatives can be weighed in the decision making process.

Let's look at some other key definitions. Reasonably foreseeable are those actions that are likely to occur or probable. For example, a master planned community development that has been approved by the planning commission and city council would be reasonably foreseeable. However, a master planned community proposal before the planning commission that proposes a zoning and general plan change and is confronted with substantial controversy may not be reasonably foreseeable. Speculative is the opposite of reasonably foreseeable and would be considered not probable even if possible.

NEPA requires that potential impacts from the project itself and the condition of a resource are evaluated to determine how it would affect the proposed freeway. The result may be that a proposed impact is identified. By building a freeway, other development may occur, such as a commercial development like a McDonalds, which would be considered a secondary impact. In many instances, public disclosure comprehensive view understanding the projects contribution important to the primary decision making responsibility of NEPA.

Scott Stapp will now share with you greater detail on these impacts and what we found during the study.

**Scott Stapp:** I was told the other day when you walk into a room and there is a microphone, you should use it. I will.

Mark provided you with the definitions for this topic. I will now talk about how we go about studying cumulative and secondary impacts. The Council on Environmental Quality issued guidance about this. The first thing that must be done is to identify the at-risk resources. There is an initial screening process that is used to identify these. The next thing is to establish the geographical boundaries. Next, a timeframe must be established for past, present and reasonably foreseeable actions. The last steps in this process are identifying past and existing actions and assessing the action's contribution to the overall impact of the resource.

The Study Team then determines the cumulative impact severity using an impact classification system that has been established by guidance from the Federal Highway Administration. The type, severity and duration will vary dependent upon the resource, spatial and temporal parameters. For example, the type of impact contributing to loss of farmland would be minor if the overall rate of loss is rapid from numerous other actions and/or the contribution is negligible. However, the type of impact might be considered substantial if the rate of loss of farmland is slow and/or the contribution to the loss from the action is great.

There are many elements that are studied as a part of cumulative and secondary impacts, for tonight's presentation, we will be discussing biological, water, and cultural resources, and air quality and land use.

As far as biological resources are concerned, there is a habitat loss component that must be considered. The Study Team must set the geographical boundary before the study can begin. So for purposes of this study, when we are talking about habitat loss, we are talking about development in Maricopa County. From 1975 to 2000, the proportion of land in a built environment increased an estimated 15 percent with the most rapid conversion from 1975 to 1986. More recently, there is still ongoing planned and permitted residential, commercial and transportation development. For example, in 2005, there were 213 development proposals, largely consisting of new residential subdivisions, which were identified in the Study Area. The Study Team anticipates that we will see similar conversion rates into the foreseeable future. Because of this, it was determined that the severity of the proposed action to the cumulative impact would be moderate.

As far as the agricultural lands, the direct conversion of this land to planned and permitted residential, commercial and transportation development would largely consist of new residential subdivisions. Currently, 29 percent of the land use in the Study Area is in agricultural use. Only 9 percent is planned for future agricultural uses. It is anticipated that there will be a similar conversion rate in the foreseeable future. The type of farmland

impact from past, present and reasonably foreseeable actions would be negative while the severity of the freeway in regards to the cumulative impact would be minor.

The considerations for the secondary impacts must also be considered. The action caused by the proposed action must be reasonably foreseeable, including any other influences that should be taken into account. It must be considered that the reasonably foreseeable action would have occurred anyway, but elsewhere. In the case of this proposed project, the effects from the conversion of land are reasonably foreseeable and would be a secondary impact but the freeway would be facilitating an impact that would have occurred regardless because it was planned for and reasonably foreseeable. The rate of conversion is likely going to increase. So is a change in the rate of planned conversions an action leading to a secondary impact or an induced growth? Not necessarily as the conversion was planned. However, the freeway would improve the regional transportation network; and enhance opportunity to expand the future planned regional transportation network, which in turn could enhance access to agricultural areas planned for development. This enhanced access could contribute to unplanned land conversions.

The secondary impacts are also evaluated and classified by the severity of impact to the Study Area. The same severity classification is applied as was used for the cumulative analyses.

Again tonight we will discuss only a few of the resources that were studied as a part of the secondary impacts.

As far as cultural disturbances, there would be some impacts to historic and prehistoric sites in the Study Area. The proposed freeway would contribute to an increased rate of planned land conversion. Private developments may result in the conversion of undisturbed land leading to discovery of previously unidentified cultural resources. Even though the conversion of undisturbed lands to human-based development would be expected with or without the proposed action, the proposed freeway would contribute to negative, minor secondary impacts.

The land use impacts in the Study Area were also considered. The freeway would not induce reasonably foreseeable changes in the pattern of planned land use, population density or projected growth rate that are planned for but would facilitate an increase in the rate of conversions to planned use. The proposed action would also improve the regional transportation network and enhance opportunity to expand the future planned regional transportation network outside of the Study Area, which in turn could enhance access to agricultural areas not already planned for development. Because of this, the freeway would contribute to negative, minor secondary impacts.

The National Environmental Policy Act does not specifically require substantive mitigation for project impacts; direct, indirect or cumulative, but the Council on Environmental Quality regulations require that Environmental Impact Statements include consideration and discussion of possible mitigation. The Federal Highway

Administration's responsibility for mitigating impacts is best described as being used when the impacts for which the mitigation is proposed actually result from the action; and the mitigation represents a reasonable public expenditure after considering the impacts and the benefits of the mitigation measures. Therefore, mitigation proposals must be both reasonable and related to project impacts. With that being said, there are no simple answers. At times, a mitigation proposal can be further reaching and address impacts other than direct impacts from the action.

If the project were not constructed, there would be no project-specific impacts. However, impacts generated by other actions would occur, but may be displaced further in time and location. Also, the No Action Alternative would not preclude other activities from affecting resources in a similar matter; most cumulative impacts would continue from ongoing conversion of land to other development.

From the information that I just presented, there are several general conclusions that can be made. The project would contribute to secondary and cumulative impacts. The project's contributions will be disclosed in accordance with the NEPA process. The overall project's contributions to secondary and cumulative impacts would be minor. It does not appear that any of the alternatives present would have distinct differences in contribution to secondary and cumulative impacts

Now, let's talk about induced travel and growth.

**Tom Keller:** Is everyone able to hear the presentation okay?

**SMCAT Member:** Can I ask for a clarification on the statement on slide 41 that the overall project's contributions to secondary and cumulative impacts would be minor? You already informed us that this is a subjective comment. Can you tell me who made this recommendation?

**Bill Vachon:** This was a decision made collaboratively by the agencies involved. It was a decision between ADOT and the Federal Highway Administration.

**SMCAT Member:** Can you be more specific?

**Bill Vachon:** ADOT and FHWA looked at all the information contained in the studies, the information provided by the public, and made a decision based on the available information.

**SMCAT Member:** So basically ADOT and FHWA made the decision?

**Bill Vachon:** Yes.

**Tom Keller:** Okay Scott, go ahead and continue.

**Scott Stapp:** The terms that are used here are induced travel, demand and growth. Induced travel has an indirect effect and relates to the increased traffic observed on a freeway after it has opened. Induced demand is the increased traffic that is observed later in time that increases the demand for freeway use. Induced growth refers to unplanned growth or urban sprawl.

As improvements are made to all transportation systems, cyclical benefits and undesirable outcomes occur. Capacity improvements, such as enhanced transit performance leads to increased ridership. As congestion increases; there is a reduction in transit performance. As transit performance is reduced, there are decisions made to drive on the freeway. Induced travel would occur and is accounted for in the Maricopa Association of Governments' regional traffic model. Therefore, this induced travel is also considered in the analysis of direct impacts that are traffic related. For example, the air quality and traffic noise analyses considered this induced travel in the analysis of direct impacts.

There are certain factors for induced growth: improved access may make land more attractive for development, other variables contribute to where and how development would occur, and historical demographic growth rates and land planning patterns must be taken into account. Other factors include: the 1950-1980 Valley growth rates and the initial plans for the Regional Freeway System and the associated land uses.

So would this proposed freeway cause induced growth? It would not provide new or substantially improve access to a large undeveloped geographic area where growth is not accounted and planned. It would also occur in an area planned for urban growth as established in local jurisdiction land use planning activities for as much as the last 20 years. Finally, it would not alter in any substantial way land use patterns in the Valley or Study Area.

Greenhouse gas is a growing national and international concern, which is inherently a global issue. Vehicles are a major source of greenhouse gases, particularly from the carbon dioxide emissions. The impact determination and nature of the concern do not fit well to an analysis at a local level because the current evaluation tools are not sophisticated enough. Because of this, regional level analysis may be more meaningful than attempting to address a global issue at a project level. In fact, the Environmental Protection Agency has been unable to establish any national standards regarding this issue.

Are there any questions?

**SMCAT Member:** I have a strong objection to that statement about greenhouse gas. I would think it would be fairly easy to determine the effect on the environment on a global scale. Can't you calculate the emissions from the additional vehicles that would be using the proposed freeway?

**Scott Stapp:** We can perform a greenhouse gas emissions inventory; however, this will not tell us anything about how this freeway would contribute to pollution on a global basis.

**SMCAT Member:** So the study team is not going to address this issue? You just said you were not going to quantify it.

**Scott Stapp:** There is no way to quantify this issue on a global level. Some of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards pollutants may have a short lifespan, but a pollutant, such as carbon dioxide, can be in the air for 100 years before decomposing. So again, this is a totally different animal when trying to address this issue on a project basis.

**SMCAT Member:** I still don't understand. If you have a projected vehicle count for this proposed freeway and you can estimate the pollution that is released by each vehicle, why can't you determine the impacts to greenhouse gas?

**Scott Stapp:** Yes. We can do a greenhouse gas emissions inventory.

**SMCAT Member:** Can you also look at the state standards for air quality and see how well this proposed freeway would meet those goals?

**Mike Bruder:** Evaluating how vehicles on this freeway would contribute to air quality issues in the Valley is a part of this study.

**SMCAT Member:** So you can do an inventory of greenhouse gas emissions, but you can't evaluate the environmental impacts?

**Scott Stapp:** The question is regarding the comparison of emissions. There is nothing that the emissions from this project could be compared with to show overall greenhouse gas emissions on a global scale. What we are talking about is the amount of displaced trips not new trips. One of the goals of the project would be to reduce traffic congestion. This would produce an overall improvement in traffic emissions and should, therefore, reduce overall greenhouse gas emissions.

**SMCAT Member:** Well the additional vehicles would be contributing to the carbon dioxide levels.

**Ben Spargo:** I know everyone has a lot of questions about air quality. Air quality was included as a part of this topic so that you could see that it was addressed as a part of cumulative and secondary impacts. I think that the questions you have regarding air quality will be better addressed in our future meetings when that is the topic and experts in the field will be in attendance.

**Tom Keller:** Yes. After we take our break, we will be discussing membership for the air quality panel.

**SMCAT Member:** I need a clarification for the information in the presentation. On slide 51, it is stated that regional analysis may be more meaningful. The text on slide 50 states that the analysis does not fit well at a local level. Is there a difference between the terms local and regional?

**Scott Stapp:** Local area would refer to something similar in size to the project area. When we refer to a regional area, this would mean a county-sized area or larger.

**SMCAT Member:** Does the Draft EIS include a greenhouse gas emissions inventory in the Study Area?

**Scott Stapp:** It does not.

**Tom Keller:** Are there any additional questions?

*No response*

**Tom Keller:** It is now 7 p.m. Do you feel you want to have a break at this point?

**SMCAT Member:** How long is the next presentation?

**Timothy Tait:** It won't take that long.

Well, good evening. I am Tim Tait. I would like to briefly go through this presentation on public comments.

Like all the other topics we have been discussing in these meetings, public comments are a part of the Draft EIS. In fact, there is a section about the Citizen Advisory Team activities within the public comment chapter.

So, why include the public in the Draft EIS process? Public involvement is an integral part of the NEPA process and it is important to understand the public's issues and concerns. Some of the goals of the process are to assist the study team in determining the project scope, to identify key issues to consider during the process and to provide the team with input as the issues and concerns evolve over time. I think these goals are well reflected in this group. The bottom line is that ADOT wants to effectively engage the public as a whole.

How has the public been involved? This public involvement work on this potential project has been extensive. More than 790 newspaper articles have been published about this proposed freeway. ADOT has given more than 200 presentations and held 10 public meetings. Newsletters and fliers have been sent out during the process to inform the public about the study progress. In fact, the next newsletter will be mailed in early November. The latest information has also been made available on the study Web site,

including the information presented at these meetings. For the most part, these are the things you would expect. By far, the most public comments have been received through e-mail. The study team has received over 5,000 e-mails. Those comments sure keep us busy. In comparison, the study team has received about 500 calls on the study hotline.

Here is a sampling of some of the comments from the public. We have sorted them into rough categories: alternatives, community, construction, design, environmental and miscellaneous. This is only a sampling of the comments received and not the comprehensive collection. Some people suggested that ADOT construct one of the various proposed alternatives, including the no-build. Some people thought that the freeway would cause an increase in traffic congestion to the local streets. Other people asked why ADOT did not construct this freeway years ago, before the area experienced its recent development. Other questions included those about the location of the proposed traffic interchanges or when the Draft EIS would be available for public review. As I mentioned before, this is just a sampling of the comments and questions ADOT has received.

There are lots of opportunities coming up for the public to comment on this study. When the Draft EIS is released for public review, there will be a 90-day review period. This is double the amount of time that the law requires; ADOT felt that there should be ample time provided to the public to review this environmental document. During this timeframe, there will be a public hearing where the public can submit formal comments to a court reporter. The comments recorded during the public hearing will also be included and integrated into the Final EIS. When the Final EIS is released for public review, there will be a 60-day review period, which is also longer than the amount of time that the law allows. If it is decided that the proposed freeway will be constructed, public outreach will continue through design and construction.

I told you that my section was short.

**SMCAT Member:** At what point during the 90-day review will the public hearing be held?

**Timothy Tait:** We haven't yet scheduled it. If you have any ideas regarding the timing, I would like to hear them.

**SMCAT Member:** I think it would be beneficial for the group to have a discussion about this.

**Bill Vachon:** For past studies, the hearing has typically been held about halfway through the public review period. This allows the public time to review the document before the hearing and allows the public time to submit comments after the hearing. It is not a hard and fast rule that it has to occur at that point.

**SMCAT Member:** What is the expected outcome of the public hearing? If you receive enough public comments saying that the freeway should not be built, can this stop the construction of the freeway? What is the point of a 90-day review period if the public finds this proposed project objectionable?

**Timothy Tait:** Public comments can influence the Draft EIS. The point of having a 90-day public review period is to allow the public the time to review the environmental document. This will help in providing transparency to the proposed project. The public has not seen the Draft EIS. This process will provide the public the opportunity to review the document and give us comments that we can use to make revisions to the Draft EIS, as necessary.

**SMCAT Member:** Let's say some of the public statements you receive about air quality impacts prove that this proposed freeway would create adverse impacts. Would you then make a decision to not build this freeway based on those impacts? Who would make this determination?

**Timothy Tait:** Ultimately, the point of this process is so the agencies can make an informed decision.

**SMCAT Member:** What would be the showstopper for this proposed project?

**Timothy Tait:** We have heard that question before. It is impossible for me to identify any one element that would prevent this proposed project from being constructed.

**SMCAT Member:** Typically how much time does it take to release the Final EIS after the end of the 90-day public review of the Draft EIS?

**Bill Vachon:** There is no designated timeframe. We have to make sure that we have time to respond to the comments that were received during the 90-day timeframe. The timing depends on the number and type of comments received.

**SMCAT Member:** What has this timeframe been historically?

**Bill Vachon:** Generally, it is a six to nine month timeframe.

**SMCAT Member:** If ADOT goes through the entire process and the final recommendation is to build the freeway, is there a time limit on construction before the document supporting the construction is outdated?

**Bill Vachon:** Once a decision has been made on an environmental document, there is a three-year window where the construction would need to take place. If no construction had been started in this time, the environmental document would need to be revisited.

**SMCAT Member:** What does that mean?

**Bill Vachon:** There would need to be an evaluation of the contents of the environmental document. For example on this project, a model may be developed that would evaluate how a freeway, such as this, would affect greenhouse gases on a global level. This would then be something that would need to be reevaluated after the three-year timeframe.

**Timothy Tait:** To underscore that point, ADOT underwent an Environmental Assessment process in 1988 for this proposed freeway. Clearly, ADOT could not use this report as supporting documentation for the construction of this freeway.

**SMCAT Member:** Yes, there are many more environmental requirements now.

**Bill Vachon:** This study is now a federal process, as well.

**SMCAT Member:** I have a legal question. It sounds as though the public hearing will allow the public the opportunity to make formal comments about the project. Does this mean that if a person is unable to attend the public hearing and they wish to take formal legal action, they will be precluded from doing so?

**Bill Vachon:** From a federal perspective, all comments submitted during the entire public involvement process—not just from the public hearing are being considered equally.

**Tom Keller:** There is an unusual set of circumstances here; a SMCAT member wants to make a special comment.

**SMCAT Member:** I am not sure who knows this, but Bill Vachon will be retiring at the end of the year. I would like to tell him good-bye and thank him for his hard work on this study. I have missed a couple of these meetings, but I don't ever recall him missing any. There is a card in the back of the room for anyone who would like to sign it.

**Tom Keller:** It is now 7:20 p.m. We will take our break. Please return to your seats by 7:30 p.m.

*Break at 7:20 p.m.*

**Tom Keller:** Can I have your attention? Please take your seats so we can proceed.

Let's go ahead and get started. If any members of the public have any questions, feel free to fill out a blue question and comment card so it can be addressed at the end of this meeting. I have also passed out the session feedback forms to the SMCAT members. Please complete both sides of the form and return them to a study team member at the end of this meeting.

At this point, we will have our discussion about the air quality panel. There will be two meetings in the future to discuss this topic. At this point in time, these meetings are

unscheduled. We have already received a number of recommendations for the air quality panel. Tonight, we want to make sure that we have all of your recommendations for membership and topics at these two meetings.

**SMCAT Member:** I have a question. We have already suggested some people to be on the air quality panel. Has anyone accepted our invitation to be a part of the panel?

**Timothy Tait:** After tonight's meeting, ADOT will go through the process of contacting these individuals.

**SMCAT Member:** I am aware of a couple of organizations that have been involved in projects in Colorado. In particular, the projects they work on deal with the issue of air quality as it relates to schools.

**Fred Erickson:** Could you please write the contact information for these organizations on your session feedback form?

**SMCAT Member:** Yes.

**SMCAT Member:** Before ADOT contacts these organizations, they should evaluate who is being asked to be a part of the air quality panel and ensure that there is no duplication of specialties of the members, especially for inventories modeling.

**SMCAT Member:** I want to know when this air quality evaluation will be performed. Will it be done at the dirtiest time of year and at what elevation? I would like this information.

**Timothy Tait:** The air quality evaluation has already been performed.

**SMCAT Member:** What year was this done?

**Timothy Tait:** Some portions of the air quality testing have been done over the last few months.

**SMCAT Member:** I wasn't aware of that.

**Timothy Tait:** We haven't discussed this issue yet. That is the purpose of the two future meetings concerning air quality.

**SMCAT Member:** Why can't you share the air quality information with us now?

**Timothy Tait:** This is sensitive information in the Draft EIS. This data cannot be shared with the public until this draft is released.

**SMCAT Member:** Regarding panel membership, you haven't contacted the person I suggested at the last meeting who works for ADOT in the Globe District?

**Timothy Tait:** No. We have to decide if this person would be an appropriate representative on the panel.

**SMCAT Member:** So from the people we suggest, you are only contacting the people who you think would be appropriate?

**Timothy Tait:** No. This is a special issue since he works for ADOT.

**SMCAT Member:** But, he hasn't been contacted yet?

**Ben Spargo:** There is an issue with the timing of the meeting. We don't even have a tentative date at this time so it is a little harder to put the list together. Once we have a date, it will be easier for the people we are proposing on the panel to know if they are available.

**SMCAT Member:** I don't understand why ADOT is going to filter out the people that we are suggesting for the air quality panel.

**Timothy Tait:** The only person requiring approval is the ADOT Globe District representative. Our only concern is because he is an agency representative. It may be a difficult fit.

**SMCAT Member:** Okay.

**Tom Keller:** Are there any other comments or suggestions?

*No response*

**Tom Keller:** Okay. As Ben mentioned, there is a difficulty in inviting the people to attend the air quality panel when we don't know when those meetings will happen.

Should we go on to the next topic?

*No response*

**Tom Keller:** As you know, this is our last scheduled meeting. One of the challenges is what will be done during this protracted period of time before we meet again. How do we communicate in this interim? We are looking for suggestions to convey an open and transparent sharing of information, as best as possible.

**SMCAT Member:** I am just brainstorming here. I am wondering if we could still meet on a monthly basis. This could be a shorter meeting without food. The point would be to

just keep the process rolling so we don't feel like we have to backtrack to start the whole thing up again.

**SMCAT Member:** I think that would be a great idea. In addition, I would like to hear information about air quality so that when the Draft EIS is released, we can all understand what we are reading.

**Tom Keller:** Well that is the purpose of the first air quality panel meeting.

**SMCAT Member:** In the 90-day public review period, I will need time to get my mind around this issue. There is an enormous amount of information regarding this topic. We want to be educated on this matter.

**SMCAT Member:** Along those lines, would it be possible to look at the air quality environmental assessments from several other Valley freeway segments? We could use them as a guideline.

**Timothy Tait:** I think that is why we are planning that first air quality panel meeting. It will be dedicated to educating the SMCAT members about air quality.

**SMCAT Member:** We could use the information from other environmental assessments and play with that information. It could be practice data for us.

**SMCAT Member:** Yes, so we can ask intelligent questions.

**Bill Vachon:** Well, this is the first project that is studying the subject of Mobile Source Air Toxins. There are no other studies in Arizona that have looked at this.

**SMCAT Member:** Interstate 95 in Las Vegas has looked at Mobile Source Air Toxins. Is any of the money funding the study of the air toxins from the transportation pool fund, which dedicated money to certain states in the region? Also, why are you not teaching us about air quality information until the 90-day public review period of the Draft EIS?

**SMCAT Member:** I agree. I think it is a reasonable question. What is so unreasonable about giving us the information we need to understand the material related to air quality?

**Timothy Tait:** The schedule we are using for this subject has been the plan for two years now. We can talk about air quality data from other places, but we aren't in Nevada.

**SMCAT Member:** I would think that Mobile Source Air Toxins issue in Las Vegas is applicable. There was an issue of a school being located close to a freeway. At one point, the students are closer to the drivers of the cars on the freeway than they are from the school nurse. I don't think that looking at the air quality information from this freeway would be such an unreasonable request.

**SMCAT Member:** I think this is something you should be addressing in the environmental document.

**Timothy Tait:** Ultimately, you don't know what ADOT has looked at until you are able to review the Draft EIS. When this document is released, we can have an in-depth discussion and educate you on air quality.

**SMCAT Member:** When would this be?

**Timothy Tait:** We are unsure at this point.

**SMCAT Member:** You were asking us about what we should do to stay focused over the break. Why can't we get together monthly and you can educate us about air quality?

**Timothy Tait:** ADOT doesn't want to keep meeting solely for the purpose of meeting. I don't see everyone wanting to meet for the next nine months to talk about the background of air quality.

**SMCAT Member:** What would ADOT like to see us do between now and the release of the Draft EIS?

**Timothy Tait:** Well, you could go back through the five years of materials and discuss the information with the organization that you represent. You could also be ambassadors for the process and explain the next steps to them.

**SMCAT Member:** You mean not in a formal way?

**Timothy Tait:** The discussion could be neighbor to neighbor.

**SMCAT Member:** Will there be oversight of the decisions concerning air quality?

**Timothy Tait:** ADOT is not acting alone on this issue. The Federal Highway Administration, Environmental Protection Agency and Bureau of Indian Affairs are assisting with the development of this section in the Draft EIS.

**SMCAT Member:** This group had made a decision that ADOT should teach us what we will need to know when reviewing the Draft EIS. We have a meeting scheduled to accomplish this. I don't see why some of our members are pressing this issue.

**SMCAT Member:** Are you sure that we are going to learn all we need to know about air quality in two to three hours?

**SMCAT Member:** This is what we all voted for. We will just need to learn about the state mandated air quality levels, if these levels are being met and Mobile Source Air Toxins.

**SMCAT Member:** Like Bill said, there are no studies that have addressed Mobile Source Air Toxins.

**Bill Vachon:** I said there were no studies in Arizona.

**SMCAT Member:** I just think that if there is information on other air quality studies from other places in the country that we should use them as a resource. I don't think anyone is questioning the process here.

**SMCAT Member:** ADOT didn't make the process. We made the process.

**SMCAT Member:** What do you mean?

**SMCAT Member:** This doesn't have anything to do with ADOT.

**SMCAT Member:** But we are going to have questions about the air quality issue and how it would affect this potential freeway.

**SMCAT Member:** You can ask any questions you want to ask. The process will be in any manner that we agree. It is not designed around the questions we need to ask ADOT.

**SMCAT Member:** So, is it possible that we are going to have a nine-month vacation?

**Tom Keller:** It is possible.

**SMCAT Member:** I don't think that one two-hour session will be enough for us to learn all we will need to know about air quality. I know we already voted on this, but I think we should go back and rethink what we need.

**SMCAT Member:** A great point has been brought up in this discussion. A nine-month hiatus is just too long. I think this is a great opportunity for us to begin educating ourselves about the air quality issue. I think we could do a good job researching this information so we can ask really good questions in the future meetings about the subject.

**Timothy Tait:** I think that is a good idea. There are certainly many sources of information out there.

**SMCAT Member:** I have a question about the release of the Draft EIS. Will you know about a month in advance prior to the release of the draft or will it just suddenly be released one day?

**Timothy Tait:** We will know when we are close to releasing the draft. At that point, we will begin mobilizing the resources.

**SMCAT Member:** What will you do to make us aware that the draft is being released? Will you send out a notice, perhaps three or six months prior?

**Timothy Tait:** We are still working on the specifics for the notification.

**SMCAT Member:** I wish to make a suggestion that at a minimum, ADOT e-mail us a monthly communication with updates about the status of the Draft EIS. During this time, if there is enough information about a particular subject that would warrant an additional SMCAT meeting, then we can address meeting again at that time.

**Tom Keller:** It was discussed in our last meeting that there would be monthly communication from ADOT. It seems that there might need to be some repository to ensure that the SMCAT is receiving the same information at the same time and that everyone is informed in a timely manner. We have some time to mobilize. There are many things that could happen between now and the time we meet again. For instance, an organization that is represented here tonight could have a different representative by the next meeting. You never know what is going to happen in the future. The most important thing is that we keep everyone informed and that we have a system in place so that the information is available to everyone who wishes to access it.

**SMCAT Member:** So you mean, it should be online like on a bulletin board?

**Tom Keller:** We entertained that idea.

**SMCAT Member:** I think there could be a monthly e-mail sent to the SMCAT members and it could include articles about Mobile Source Air Toxins that we could read to educate ourselves.

**Tom Keller:** Fred and I have thought about organize something that could be available on our servers. However, this may be something that will need to be made available on the ADOT Web site. We haven't figured this out yet.

**SMCAT Member:** Can we resolve this issue, before we turn the lights off in the room tonight?

**Tom Keller:** Well, we aren't meeting after tonight, so we need to find a resolution to this.

**SMCAT Member:** Can you restate the proposal?

**Tom Keller:** The intent is that we have a regular communication repository, which would be a one stop shop to see what communication is going on between ADOT and the SMCAT members. For those who don't have electronic communication capability, we could still mail hardcopy versions of the information. Do I have your permission that we form the details behind the scenes and get back to you?

**SMCAT Member:** Yes.

**Tom Keller:** Members of the ADOT study team, does this work for you?

**Timothy Tait:** Yes, the essence is good.

**SMCAT Member:** Is there something that could be added to the study Web site where SMCAT members could log in to access the information in a secure location?

**Timothy Tait:** In short, no. Just like all of these meetings are open to the public, so shall be the information for any of these e-mail communications done during the break between meetings.

**SMCAT Member:** So any online forum or bulletin board would also be available to the public?

**Timothy Tait:** Yes, for whoever would be interested.

**SMCAT Member:** That would be great.

**Fred Erickson:** Can I have a show of hands, who would be interested in interacting through an online forum or bulletin board where the public could watch, but not participate?

**SMCAT Member:** It depends what is being discussed.

**Tom Keller:** I am only asking if you are open to the idea of using this as a resource.

**Fred Erickson:** We just want to make sure that this is something that the SMCAT members would use.

**SMCAT Member:** I would be reluctant to use this because the public comments could become an issue.

**Fred Erickson:** We could control this.

**Timothy Tait:** We would want to provide an avenue for the public to comment, but it would be done in a separate online area.

**Tom Keller:** It is important to remember that you are representing an organization and not yourself so this would be a resource that people in your organization could use as well.

**SMCAT Member:** I think, as with anything, there are liabilities and limitations to this type of exchange of information.

**Tom Keller:** Are you familiar with the role of an online moderator? It is not unlike what Fred and I do at these meetings.

*No response*

**Tom Keller:** Moderators control these online areas. This is similar to the SMCAT members who keep us on track when it comes to items in the parking lot issue memorandum. If we haven't answered your questions in this document, you let us know. So where are we with this?

**SMCAT Member:** I don't know if there is any precedence for this sort of thing, whether we should continue with these face-to-face meetings or communicate in an online chat room. I don't think communicating in an online chat room would set a good precedent. I would like to go back to my original suggestion, which is continuing these meetings, as long as there is new information to be discussed. If there is nothing new then we don't have a meeting. If something changes where there is adequate information to discuss, then we would have a meeting. I really don't think we should be using an online forum or bulletin board.

**Tom Keller:** So if we take your input and produce a monthly report with the questions that have been asked over a monthly period from the SMCAT members, would that work for you?

**SMCAT Member:** Yes, that works for me.

**Tom Keller:** Does this work for the rest of you?

**SMCAT Member:** I think having the electronic version of updates posted by ADOT is a compromise. I still prefer that we schedule more than two meetings to discuss air quality.

**SMCAT Member:** I agree.

**SMCAT Member:** I think we should set the next SMCAT meeting for two or three months in the future. At that time we can discuss how the online communication has gone. I am thinking the Draft EIS will not be released for another year.

**Tom Keller:** That might be a relatively short meeting.

**SMCAT Member:** I am just brainstorming.

**SMCAT Member:** Could we couple this topic with some air quality training?

**Tom Keller:** I don't know.

**SMCAT Member:** What if we were to form a subcommittee to discuss air quality? The subcommittee could provide information on this subject to the rest of the group.

**SMCAT Member:** I don't want to go a whole year without meeting. I make a proposal that we continue meeting once every four months. If you want to solve the air quality education issue than anyone of us who comes across this information can pass it along to each other at these meetings. ADOT would not have to give us their presentation on air quality, until they are ready. Does meeting every four months sound reasonable to everyone?

**Tom Keller:** Is this in addition to ADOT's monthly communication?

**SMCAT Member:** Yes. If there is no information about the timing of the release of the Draft EIS, ADOT should still send an e-mail stating this.

**SMCAT Member:** I think ADOT should include information on the study Web site that would assist us in our education of air quality.

**SMCAT Member:** Can I make a motion that our next official meeting is scheduled for February? In between now and then, our fearless leaders would put something online so that we all can keep in contact in the interim.

**Tom Keller:** There is a motion on the floor. Is there any discussion of this matter?

**SMCAT Member:** What was the motion? Is it that we meet in February and ADOT makes something available online so that we can communicate?

**SMCAT Member:** Well, I suggest that we make a modification to the motion so that we could still hold a meeting between now and February should some something arise that we would need to discuss. I just don't want to be tied to the four-month timeframe.

**SMCAT Member:** That is fine.

**Tom Keller:** So there has been a change to the motion. The next official meeting will be in February, unless something comes up that would require us to meet sooner.

**Tom Keller:** Is there a second to this motion?

**SMCAT Member:** I second the motion.

**Tom Keller:** All in favor? Please raise your hands.

**Fred Erickson:** I count 12 hands raised.

**Tom Keller:** Who is opposed?

*No hands were raised*

**Tom Keller:** The motion passes.

So do you all agree that ADOT should send monthly communication to you that will be in an open environment that is transparent? This would be done so that you can be informed about the latest study information during our break until we meet again in February. In the interim, is there any topic information that you request to be included in this monthly correspondence?

**SMCAT Member:** I take exception to your statement. I thought we would be meeting before February if some important issue comes up.

**Tom Keller:** Yes, that's what I intended to say. Is there any other input before we go to the public questions?

**SMCAT Member:** Since this idea of being transparent is important to you and ADOT, the e-mail that is sent should contain language that the communication is a public document.

**Tom Keller:** I think there is some verbiage that has been designed for this purpose.

Okay, three blue question and comment cards have been submitted by individuals from the public.

**Public Written Question:** Will the resources discussed by Tim tonight be put on the Web site so the public can also access them?

**Public Comment:** I believe my question has already been answered.

**Public Written Question:** Regarding induced traffic volume to the Study Area, what does the Maricopa Association of Governments' model show for traffic diverted from the AZ 85 Gila Bend–Buckeye Phoenix bypass onto the South Mountain Freeway?

**Ben Spargo:** You mean the traffic on Interstate 8 with and without the proposed freeway?

**Public Comment:** Yes.

**Ben Spargo:** I will have to look this information up. I don't have it with me.

**Public Question:** Will the results of all your studies be based on a 6- or 10-lane roadway?

**Ben Spargo:** All of the environmental analysis performed was for a 10-lane facility.

**Public Written Question:** Given the discussion concerning a funding shortfall and the possibility of reducing the scale of the freeway from 10 down to six lanes, at what point would this decision be made?

**Timothy Tait:** Those decisions will be made by the Maricopa Association of Governments in the first half of 2009.

**Public Written Question:** (Two questions submitted similar in content) The purported benefits of this project—extending out to 2030—were these based on a 6- or 10-lane freeway?

**Ben Spargo:** It would be based on the 10-lane facility.

**Public Question:** Yes, does that mean you would need to start a new study if the project is changed so that the ultimate design is only a 6-lane roadway?

**Bill Vachon:** I don't know if we would have to start all over but there are many things that would need to be revisited.

**Tom Keller:** Are there any other questions or comments?

*No response*

**Tom Keller:** Before I ask for a motion for adjournment, please remember to turn in your session feedback forms. Everyone have a great holiday vacation.

**SMCAT Member:** I make a motion that we adjourn.

**Tom Keller:** Is there a second?

**SMCAT Member:** I second the motion.

**Tom Keller:** All in favor?

The meeting is adjourned.

*Meeting ended at 8:27 p.m.*

*All blue public question comment cards were addressed in this meeting.*